

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-7 are pending in the instant application. In the Office Action dated April 30, 2004, the Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) that is recited in the Background section of the application. The Examiner has further allowed claims 2-7.

The Office Action cites page 1, line 22 to page 2, line 10 as the anticipating AAPA. Those text sections do not address that the common idle frame contains a set of time slots, as recited in claim 1. Further details as to prior art time slots within the idle frame are in the remaining two paragraphs of the Background section, page 2, lines 11-28, where the AAPA unambiguously ties the idle frame measurement window to a traffic time slot. Specifically, page 2, lines 13-17 recites "... it does not imply that all of the measurement windows will occur at the same time. In practice, the measurement window position depends on which time slot is assigned for traffic use for a particular mobile station." and page 2, lines 17-20 recites "... there exists eight possible measurement windows for the eight possible traffic time slots ...". A disadvantage of this prior art tying of measurement windows to traffic time slots is recited, and a specific example is given, at page 2, lines 22-28. The same disadvantage is illustrated at prior art Figure 4, where certain measurement windows (which the background section recites are tied to traffic time slots) do not fully envelope the idle frame.

Against that AAPA, claim 1 recites, in relevant part:

arranging individual transmissions such that all pertinent information for a mobile station is transmitted within a subset of timeslots of the idle frame, without regard for which traffic time slot the mobile station is assigned to.

Whereas the AAPA recites that a mobile station's measurement window is tied to a traffic frame (which by prior art Figure 4 may occupy only a subset of timeslots of the idle frame), claim 1 recites that the relevant subset of timeslots of the idle frame is without regard for the mobile station's assigned traffic time slot.

Applicant submits that claim 1 is novel over the AAPA for the reasons stated above and in the application itself, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass each of claims 1-7 to issue without further delay. If any of the above remarks are unclear or if the Examiner

harbors further reservations as to the patentability of claim 1, the undersigned representative invites the Examiner to discuss them via teleconference as the Examiner deems appropriate.

Respectfully submitted:


Gerald J. Stanton
Reg. No.: 46,008

July 14, 2004
Date

Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Phone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245
Email: gstanton@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

July 14, 2004
Date


Ann Okrentowich